

**REMARKS**

The Office Action dated February 21, 2006, has been received and carefully considered. Claims 151-177 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the outstanding election/restriction requirement is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

I. THE ELECTION/RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the present application contains claims directed to two patentably distinct inventions: claims 151-162 drawn to a memory device having a clock receiver, a register, and a plurality of input receivers to sample operation codes synchronously with an external clock signal; and claims 163-177 drawn to a memory device and a method of operating the memory device, wherein the memory device has a clock receiver, a clock generation circuit including a delay circuit and a comparison circuit, and a block size value.

The Applicant hereby respectfully traverses this election/restriction requirement, and hereby requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this election/restriction requirement. As required, however, the Applicant provisionally

elects claims 151-162 for prosecution in the event that this election/restriction requirement is made final.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 121, restriction is appropriate if two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application. As set forth in MPEP § 802.01, inventions are independent if there is no disclosed relationship between the two or more subjects disclosed, and inventions are distinct if two or more subjects as disclosed are capable of separate manufacture, use, or sale as claimed.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner attempts to explain how the invention defined in claims 151-162 is distinct from the invention defined in claims 163-177. However, the Examiner fails to explain how the invention defined in claims 151-162 is independent from the invention defined in claims 163-177. That is, it is clear that the invention defined in claims 151-162 and the invention defined in claims 163-177 are both directed to memory devices and share many of the same claim elements. Thus, the invention defined in claims 151-162 and the invention defined in claims 163-177 are related and are not independent from each other. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the election/restriction requirement is improper, and the withdrawal of such election/restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

II. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number, in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this communication to Deposit Account No. 50-0206, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Patent Application  
Attorney Docket No.: 57941.000062  
Client Reference No.: RA001.2003.1.C.US

Respectfully submitted,

Hunton & Williams LLP

By: 

Thomas E. Anderson

Registration No. 37,063

TEA/vrp

Hunton & Williams LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109  
Telephone: (202) 955-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 778-2201

Date: March 21, 2006